

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 are pending herein. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended as supported by page 4, lines 28-38 of the specification, for example. New independent claim 7 has been added as supported by page 4, lines 28-38 and Fig. 4 of the present application, for example. New dependent claims 8-10 have been added as supported by Figs. 1, 4 and 6 of the present application, for example.

Examiner Coolman is thanked for courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during a telephonic interview on October 27, 2006. The substance of that interview has been incorporated into the following remarks.

1. Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under §103(a) over Crocket. To the extent that this rejection may be applied against the amended claims, it is respectfully traversed.

Amended claims 1 and 2 recite an alpine ski comprising, among other things, two longitudinal elements and a cavity formed between the longitudinal elements opening longitudinally at an end. Dimensions of the cavity allow the deformation of the end such that left and right edges of the ski move closer to one another when a lateral force is exerted at contact portions of the side cut.

The dimensions of the cavity formed between the longitudinal elements allow the side cut of the ski to be deformed as a function of not only the topology of the ski run, but also the forces exerted by the skier during the ski run (page 4, lines 35-38). The deformation occurs when the ski is inclined on the edge and the extreme points of contact with the snow are close to the points of maximum width of the ski (specification, page 4, line 38 -- page 5, line 1). Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention's ability to continually be deformed as a function of the topology of the run and force exerted by the skier is a significant improvement over the prior art devices such as FR 2 794 374, which includes mechanical devices used to fix a particular amount of deformation prior to use, but does not allow for continuing or automatic adjustment while the ski is in use by a skier on a ski run. In other words, the devices of the prior art include mechanisms used to deform the longitudinal

elements of the ski before use by a skier and then fix the longitudinal elements such that the edges of the ski remain separated at the fixed distance while in use.

Crocket discloses a typical example of the prior art. Crocket discloses the use of bridges 28, 30, 32 (Fig. 1) fastened to the ski with removable fasteners or glued in a manner where they can be removed and replaced to adjust the pressure zone of the ski or shifted forward or rearward for the same purpose (Crocket, column 4, lines 45-54). The bridges 28, 30, 32 are used to modify the pressure zone characteristics without otherwise needing to change the construction of the ski (Crocket, column 3, lines 35-40). Crocket does not disclose or suggest that the ski can be used without the bridges 28, 30, 32. Furthermore, Crocket does not disclose or suggest that unrestricted movement between the edges at the ends of the skis would in any way benefit the functionality of the ski.

It is clear for the foregoing that Crocket fails to disclose an alpine ski having a cavity formed between two longitudinal elements opening longitudinally at an end of the ski, the dimensions of the cavity allowing the deformation of the end such that left and right edges of the ski move closer to one another when a lateral force is exerted at contact portions of the side cut, as recited in claims 1 and 2. Since claim 6 depends directly from claim 1, claim 6 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claim 5 was rejected under §103(a) over Crocket in view of Roumen or Ortwig. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Crocket. Since Roumen and Ortwig fail to overcome the deficiencies of Crocket, and since claim 5 depends directly from claim 1, claim 5 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection are respectfully requested.

If Examiner Coolman believes that further contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, he is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

November 27, 2006

Date

Timothy D. Evans

Stephen P. Burr

Reg. No. 32,970

Timothy D. Evans

Reg. No. 50,797

SPB/TE/tlp

BURR & BROWN

P.O. Box 7068

Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191

Telephone: (315) 233-8300

Facsimile: (315) 233-8320